



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,337	03/18/2004	Michel Valentini	251-IUS	3748
5568	7590	01/17/2007		
JACK PAAVILA BOX 1151 ALEXANDRIA, KOC IA0 CANADA			EXAMINER DEVOTI, PAUL D	
			ART UNIT 3637	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/17/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center"><b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	<p>Application No. 10/802,337</p>	<p>Applicant(s) VALENTINI, MICHEL</p>	
	<p>Examiner Paul Devoti</p>	<p>Art Unit 3637</p>	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 02 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1, 6 and 14.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

PD  
01/12/07

  
**LANNA MAI**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant's arguments submitted on 02 January 2007 have been considered but are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant's arguments about the "main section" of Meckstroth are not persuasive, as Brochu already discloses a main section (78) and only the channel on the outer side section (90) is modified. Brochu in view of Meckstroth clearly discloses all of the limitations as recited in claim 1, as seen in the rejection of claim 1 from the Final Office Action dated 08 December 2006.

Brochu discloses a gutter cover obviously capable of being used with a gutter having a top, outer lip that has a downwardly and outwardly curved end section. The gutter cover comprises a main elongated section (72), an outer side section (90), and an inner side section (82) on the other side of the main section (72). The main section (72) has perforations (74). The inner side section comprises a slot (84) that opens away from the main section, with a flexible flap (86) that is mounted in the slot (84) and extends away from the main section (72). The outer side section (90) has a channel, but Brochu does not disclose the outer side section defines a channel that opens away from the main section, with the channel defined by a top wall, bottom wall, and end wall joining the top and bottom walls along the length of the cover. Additionally, Brochu does not disclose the bottom wall of the channel is shorter than the top wall, and that the cover has a wall that forms a gripping surface. Meckstroth, however, discloses a gutter cover comprising a channel that opens away from a main section (45, 68, 71). The channel is defined by a top wall (58), a bottom wall (16), and an end wall (A) joining the top and bottom walls along the length of the cover. The bottom wall (16) of the channel is aligned with the main section (45, 68, 71) and is shorter than the top wall (58). The bottom wall (16) is spaced from the top wall (58), and the channel fits over the outer lip of a gutter. The inner surface of the end wall (A) forms a gripping surface, and could obviously be used to pull the channel over an outer lip of a gutter. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to replace the outer channel of Brochu's gutter cover with a channel as taught by Meckstroth, as this would provide a secure attachment for a gutter cover to an outer lip of a gutter.